



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,122	07/23/2003	Susan Sohn	SUN-P8124	9087

7590 12/09/2005

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP  
Third Floor  
Two North Market Street  
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

CAMPOS, YAIMA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2185

DATE MAILED: 12/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/626,122

Applicant(s)

SOHN, SUSAN

Examiner

Yaima Campos

Art Unit

2185

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The instant application having Application No. 10/626,122 has a total of 24 claims pending in the application; there are 4 independent claims and 20 dependent claims, all of which are ready for examination by the examiner.

#### **I. INFORMATION CONCERNING OATH/DECLARATION**

##### **Oath/Declaration**

2. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with **37 CFR 1.67(a)** identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

The full name of the inventor as set forth in the Oath [**Susan Sohn**] is different from the name of the inventor as set forth in the Specification [**Suesan Sohn (Page 1, line 7)**].

#### **II. STATUS OF CLAIM FOR PRIORITY IN THE APPLICATION**

3. As required by **M.P.E.P. 201.14(c)**, acknowledgement is made of applicant's claim for priority based on an application filed on June 3, 2003 (Provisional Application 60/475,675).

### **III. INFORMATION CONCERNING DRAWINGS**

#### **Drawings**

The applicant's drawings submitted are acceptable for examination purposes.

### **IV. OBJECTIONS TO THE SPECIFICATION**

#### **Specification Objections**

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The full name of the inventor as set forth in the Oath [**Susan Sohn**] is different from the name of the inventor as set forth in the Specification [**Suesan Sohn (Page 1, line 7)**].

The words "in tact" (page 14, line 3) appear to be a typographical error. It is believed these words should be "intact" and has been treated as such for the rest of this Office action.

The specification recites the limitation "a first free space that starts at cylinder 300" on page 21, lines 25 ad 26. As best understood by the examiner, this limitation refers to a free space that starts at cylinder zero. The applicant might consider correcting this limitation to read -- **a first free space that starts at cylinder 0 --**.

Appropriate correction is required.

#### **Claim Objections**

5. Claims 22, 23, 24 and 25 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Art Unit: 2185

6. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Claim number 21 has been omitted. Misnumbered claims 22, 23, 24 and 25 have been renumbered to 21, 22, 23, and 24 respectively and have been treated as such for the rest of this office action.

7. Appropriate correction is required.

## **V. REJECTIONS BASED ON PRIOR ART**

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102**

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claims **20-21, and 23-24** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ruff et al. (US 6,088,778).

10. As per **claim 20**, Ruff discloses “a system for determining a file system on a disk” as it is explained that [**“the present invention permits manipulation of**

Art Unit: 2185

**selected partitions of a computer disk drive” (Column 1, lines 1-2)] and it is disclosed providing “users with feedback regarding the current partition configuration and a command interface for molding that configuration” (Column 10, lines 3-5). Ruff further discloses “FAT (*file allocation table*) partitions defined as primary partitions on the disk 2” (Figure 1 and Column 8, lines 19-21)] “comprising: a disk coupled to a bus; a processor coupled to said bus for determining a default file system on said disk;” [With respect to this limitation, Ruff discloses “CPU 8,” “Memory 10,” “Program storage media12,” busses connecting these elements, and explains that “the medium 12 tangibly embodies a program, functions, and/or instructions that are executable by the processor 8 to perform disk partition manipulation steps according to the present invention” (Figure 1 and Column 1, lines 46-49)] “a graphical user interface for modifying said default file system layout,” [With respect to this limitation, Ruff discloses that “the displaying step 112 preferably utilizes a graphical user interface (*GUI*) in the implementing program to provide users with feedback regarding the current partition configuration and a command interface for molding that configuration” (Column 10, lines 1-5)] “including preserving a partition” [With respect to this limitation, Ruff discloses a method to “easily resize and reconfigure IBM-compatible disk partitions without destroying any user data” (Column 6, lines 3-4) and also teaches that “Journaling preserves at least one copy of all user data on the disk at all times during the partition modification” (Column 9, lines 3-5)] “wherein said default file system layout**

Art Unit: 2185

can be modified in megabytes and cylinders” **[With respect to this limitation, Ruff teaches that disk drive cylinders contain sectors and that “a given sector on the disk 2 may be identified by specifying a head, a cylinder, and a sector within the cylinder” (Column 2, lines 15-17). Ruff also discloses that cylinders have a “starting address 42 and the ending address 44” (Column 4, lines 27-33) as specifying size boundaries for cylinders; explains that a “sector count 46 holds the total number of disk sectors in the partition” (Column 3, lines 51-52) and further teaches a form of manipulating partitions that involves resizing wherein an example is disclosed as “shrinking partitions from 200 megabytes down to 127 megabytes by moving the right edge toward the left edge” (Column 16, lines 28-30) as disclosing measuring a partition in megabytes as well as cylinders. Therefore, the partition has a size given in both; cylinders and bytes/megabytes].**

11. As per claim 21 (Notice: claim 22 on Application has been renumbered to claim 21), Ruff discloses “the system as described in claim 20” **[See rejection to claim 20 above]** “wherein said default file system comprises a root partition and a swap partition” **[With respect to this limitation, Ruff teaches that “the space occupied by the file allocation table(s), boot sector(s), and root directory is the “system area” (Column 18, lines 30-32). Ruff also teaches that “all logical partitions are contained within one primary partition; a primary partition which contains logical partitions is also known as an *extended partition*” (Column 3, lines 62-64)].**

Art Unit: 2185

12. As per claim 23 (Notice: claim 24 on Application has been renumbered to claim 23) Ruff discloses “the system as described in claim 20” [See rejection to claim 20 above] “further comprising an operating system installer wizard for installing an operating system on said system” [With respect to this limitation, Ruff discloses that “it is also necessary to keep the partition locked until after rebooting if the operating system used on the computer does not support dynamic partition resynchronization through system calls or other means” (Column 24, lines 31-34) as demonstrating that an operating system other than a currently installed one may be installed. Ruff also claims “an improved method for installing an operating system” (Column 24, lines 61-62). It is inherent that in order to install an operating system, a computer system must follow a certain number of steps; therefore, this disclosure is equivalent to adding a wizard to install an operating system to the claimed invention].

13. As per claim 24 (Notice: claim 25 on Application has been renumbered to claim 24) Ruff discloses “the system as described in claim 24 (Notice: claim 24 on Application has been renumbered to claim 23)” [See rejection to claim 23 above] “wherein said operating system installer wizard is java based” [With respect to this limitation, Ruff discloses that “those skilled in the art will readily create appropriate implementing programs according to the present invention by using computer languages such as C or C++, conventional compilers and linkers, and other tools familiar to computer programmers” (Column 8, lines 49-53). At the time of the



Art Unit: 2185

invention, Java is a programming language well known to those skilled in the art; therefore, using java would have been equivalent to using any other well known programming languages such as C or C++].

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. **Claims 1-2, 5-9, 12-14 and 17-19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruff et al. (US 6,088,778) in view of Lawrence et al. (US 6,253,300).

16. As per **claims 1 and 13**, Ruff discloses "A method for determining a file system layout on a disk" as it is explained that [**"the present invention permits manipulation of selected partitions of a computer disk drive" (Column 1, lines 1-2)**] comprising "a processor coupled to a bus and a memory coupled to said bus, a computer readable medium comprising instructions that when executed implement a method of determining a file system layout on a disk" [**With respect to this limitation, Ruff discloses "CPU 8," "Memory 10," "Program storage media12," busses connecting these elements, and explains that "the medium 12 tangibly embodies a program, functions, and/or instructions that are executable by the processor 8 to perform disk partition manipulation steps according to the present invention" (Figure 1**

**and Column 1, lines 46-49)]. Ruff further discloses “providing a default file system layout comprising a root partition, a swap partition and a plurality of unassigned partitions;” [With respect to this limitation, Ruff teaches providing “users with feedback regarding the current partition configuration and a command interface for molding that configuration” (Column 10, lines 3-5), Ruff further discloses that “the space occupied by the file allocation table(s), boot sector(s), and root directory is the “system area” (Column 18, lines 30-32). Ruff also teaches that “all logical partitions are contained within one primary partition; a primary partition which contains logical partitions is also known as an *extended partition*” (Column 3, lines 62-64); and further discloses having and identifying free disk space for unassigned partitions as “free space not claimed by any partition” (Column 10, lines 31-32 and Figure 6, item 126)] “assigning a size for each of said partitions; identifying available free spaces on said disk for said unassigned partitions; ” and “assigning locations on said disk for partitions” [Ruff discloses these limitations as it is taught that “file systems are generally used in combination with *partition* to define the physical organization of data on the disk. Partitions are often defined by the contents of a *partition table*” (Column 3, lines 1-4) and further explains that the system includes manipulations such as “displaying information about a partition such as its location, size, and associated file systems type; moving a partition to a different location on a disk that presently holds the partition or to another disk; molding or resizing a partition to include a different number of disk**

Art Unit: 2185

**sectors within the partition; and resizing clusters in a FAT (*file allocation table*) partition” (Column 6, lines 41-47)].**

Ruff does not disclose expressly “sorting partitions by size assigned from largest to smallest;” nor it is disclosed “assigning partitions form largest to smallest wherein partitions are filled in available free spaces identified from end to beginning;”

Lawrence discloses “sorting partitions by size assigned from largest to smallest;” and “assigning partitions form largest to smallest wherein partitions are filled in available free spaces identified from end to beginning.” Lawrence teaches manipulation of disk partitions during replication/copying of these partitions. Lawrence discloses that [**“each region is labeled with its associated free space size and an indication of whether the region is allocated to a partition”** and also that **“the regions can be sorted into order, with the largest presently available space first, other presently available spaces next in decreasing size, followed by the largest potentially available free space and the other available free space regions in decreasing order”** (Column 14, lines 16-18 and 23-27). Lawrence further discloses that an **“allocation map allows a comparison of the available free space size with the total size of the used sectors”** and that the **“allocation map also identifies the sectors that may be copied”** (Column 16, lines 18-20 and 22-23)]. In addition, Lawrence explains that [**“the cluster or sector numbers to be restored are sorted into order”** (Column 20, lines 8-9)].

(US 6,088,778) by Ruff et al. and (US 6,253,300) by Lawrence et al. are analogous art because they are form the same field of endeavor of manipulating/modifying computer disk drive partitions.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system that permits manipulation of computer disk drive paritions taught by Ruff; further provide the ability of sorting disk partitions from largest to smallest in order to allocate free space using this organization scheme supported by an allocation map, as disclosed by Lawrence.

The motivation for doing so would have been because Lawrence teaches that sorting the regions in the allocation map allows for faster allocation of these memory regions as it is disclosed that once the locations of memory regions [**“are known they can be read into memory in one pass though the source partition” and therefore, “requires very little head movement” (Column 17, lines 56-59)**]. Lawrence further explains that [**“only one pass need be made through the image file data, because the necessary clusters have been identified and ordered during the previous steps” (Column 20, lines 14-16)**].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine (US 6,253,300) by Lawrence et al. and (US 6,088,778) by Ruff et al. for the benefit of creating a computer disk drive partition manipulation method to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1 and 13.

17. As per **claims 2 and 14**, the combination of Ruff and Lawrence discloses “the method as described in claims 1 and 13” [**See rejection to claims 1 and 13 above**] “wherein said size assigned is measured in cylinders” [**Ruff discloses**

that “a given sector on the disk may be identified by specifying a head, a cylinder, and a sector within the cylinder” (Column 2, lines 15-17). Lawrence also discloses that “the disk geometry specifies the sector size in bytes, number of sectors per track, number of heads (tracks per cylinder), and number of cylinders” (Column 12, lines 56-58)].

18. As per claims 5 and 17, the combination of Ruff and Lawrence discloses “the method as described in claims 1 and 13” [See rejection to claims 1 and 13 above] “further comprising providing a graphical user interface” [With respect to this limitation, Ruff discloses that “the displaying step 112 preferably utilizes a graphical user interface (*GUI*) in the implementing program to provide users with feedback regarding the current partition configuration and a command interface for molding that configuration” (Column 10, lines 1-5)].

19. As per claims 6 and 18, the combination of Ruff and Lawrence discloses “the method as described in claims 1 and 13” [See rejection to claims 1 and 13 above] “wherein said swap partition is assigned to one of said available free spaces” and “wherein said swap partition is assigned to the beginning of said disk” [With respect to these limitations, Ruff teaches that “all logical partitions are contained within one primary partition; a primary partition which contains logical partitions is also known as an *extended partition*” (Column 3, lines 62-64) and further discloses “FAT (*file allocation table*) partitions defined as primary partitions on the disk 2” (Figure 1 and Column 8, lines 19-21)].

Art Unit: 2185

20. As per claims 7 and 19, the combination of Ruff and Lawrence discloses, "the method as described in claims 1 and 13" [See rejection to claims 1 and 13 above] "further comprising identifying a preserved partition, wherein said preserved partition retains a location and a size" [With respect to this limitation, Ruff discloses a method to "easily resize and reconfigure IBM-compatible disk partitions without destroying any user data" (Column 6, lines 3-4) and also teaches that "Journaling preserves at least one copy of all user data on the disk at all times during the partition modification" (Column 9, lines 3-5)].

21. As per claim 8, Ruff discloses "A method for determining a file system layout on a disk" as it explained that ["the present invention permits manipulation of selected partitions of a computer disk drive" (Column 1, lines 1-2)] and providing "users with feedback regarding the current partition configuration and a command interface for molding that configuration" (Column 10, lines 3-5) and further discloses "FAT (*file allocation table*) partitions defined as primary partitions on the disk 2" (Figure 1 and Column 8, lines 19-21)], "identifying preserved blocks of said disk, each of said preserved blocks having a size and a location on said disk;" [With respect to this limitation, Ruff discloses a method to "easily resize and reconfigure IBM-compatible disk partitions without destroying any user data" (Column 6, lines 3-4) and also teaches that "Journaling preserves at least one copy of all user data on the disk at all times during the partition modification" (Column 9, lines 3-5)] "assigning a size for each of

Art Unit: 2185

said partitions; identifying available free spaces on said disk for said unassigned partitions; ” and “assigning locations on said disk for partitions” **[Ruff discloses these limitations as it is taught that “file systems are generally used in combination with *partition* to define the physical organization of data on the disk. Partitions are often defined by the contents of a *partition table*” (Column 3, lines 1-4) and further explains that the system includes manipulations such as “displaying information about a partition such as its location, size, and associated file systems type; moving a partition to a different location on a disk that presently holds the partition or to another disk; molding or resizing a partition to include a different number of disk sectors within the partition; and resizing clusters in a FAT (*file allocation table*) partition” (Column 6, lines 41-47)].**

Ruff does not disclose expressly “sorting partitions by size assigned from largest to smallest;” nor it is disclosed “assigning partitions form largest to smallest wherein partitions are filled in available free spaces identified from end to beginning.”

Lawrence discloses “sorting partitions by size assigned from largest to smallest;” and “assigning partitions form largest to smallest wherein partitions are filled in available free spaces identified from end to beginning.” Lawrence teaches manipulation of disk partitions during replication/copying of these partitions. Lawrence discloses that **[“each region is labeled with its associated free space size and an indication of whether the region is allocated to a partition” and also that “the regions can be sorted into order,**

Art Unit: 2185

**with the largest presently available space first, other presently available spaces next in decreasing size, followed by the largest potentially available free space and the other available free space regions in decreasing order” (Column 14, lines 16-18 and 23-27). Lawrence further discloses that an “allocation map allows a comparison of the available free space size with the total size of the used sectors” and that the “allocation map also identifies the sectors that may be copied” (Column 16, lines 18-20 and 22-23)]. In addition, Lawrence explains that [“the cluster or sector numbers to be restored are sorted into order” (Column 20, lines 8-9)].**

(US 6,088,778) by Ruff et al. and (US 6,253,300) by Lawrence et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating/modifying computer disk drive partitions.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system that permits manipulation of computer disk drive partitions taught by Ruff; further provide the ability of sorting disk partitions from largest to smallest in order to allocate free space using this organization scheme supported by an allocation map, as disclosed by Lawrence.

The motivation for doing so would have been because Lawrence teaches that sorting the regions in the allocation map allows for faster allocation of these memory regions as it is disclosed that once the locations of memory regions [“**are known they can be read into memory in one pass through the source partition” and therefore, “requires very little head movement” (Column 17, lines 56-59)]. Lawrence further explains that [“only one pass need be made**



**through the image file data, because the necessary clusters have been identified and ordered during the previous steps” (Column 20, lines 14-16)].**

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine (US 6,253,300) by Lawrence et al. and (US 6,088,778) by Ruff et al. for the benefit of creating a computer disk drive partition manipulation method to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

22. As per **claim 9**, the combination of Ruff and Lawrence discloses “the method as described in claim 8” **[See rejection to claim 8 above]** “wherein said size assigned is measured in cylinders” **[Ruff discloses this limitation as it is taught that “a given sector on the disk may be identified by specifying a head, a cylinder, and a sector within the cylinder” (Column 2, lines 15-17). Lawrence also discloses that “the disk geometry specifies the sector size in bytes, number of sectors per track, number of heads (tracks per cylinder), and number of cylinders” (Column 12, lines 56-58)].**

23. As per **claim 12**, the combination of Ruff and Lawrence discloses, “the method as described in claim 9” **[See rejection to claim 9 above]** “wherein one of said preserved partitions is a swap partition and is assigned to the beginning of said disk” **[With respect to this limitation, Ruff discloses that “all logical partitions are contained within one primary partition; a primary partition which contains logical partitions is also known as an *extended partition*” (Column 3, lines 62-64) and further discloses “FAT (*file allocation table*) partitions defined as primary partitions on the disk 2” (Figure 1 and Column 8, lines 19-21). Ruff also teaches a method to “easily resize and**

**reconfigure IBM-compatible disk partitions without destroying any user data” (Column 6, lines 3-4) and explains that “journaling preserves at least one copy of all user data on the disk at all times during the partition modification” (Column 9, lines 3-5)].**

24. **Claims 3-4, 10-11 and 15-16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruff et al. (US 6,088,778) and Lawrence et al. (US 6,253,300) as applied to claims **1-2, 5-9, 12-14, 17-19, 20-21, and 23-24** above, and further in view of Beardsley et al. (US 6,173,360) and Stoddard et al. (US 6,453,383).

25. As per **claims 3-4, 10-11 and 15-16**, the combination of Ruff and Lawrence discloses “the method as described in claims 2, 8 and 13” **[See rejection to claims 2, 8 and 13 above]** wherein Ruff teaches that disk drive cylinders contain sectors and that **[“a given sector on the disk 2 may be identified by specifying a head, a cylinder, and a sector within the cylinder” (Column 2, lines 15-17)]**. Ruff also discloses that cylinders have a **[“starting address 42 and the ending address 44” (Column 4, lines 27-33)]** as specifying size boundaries for cylinders; explains that a **[“sector count 46 holds the total number of disk sectors in the partition” (Column 3, lines 51-52)]** and further teaches a form of manipulating partitions that involves resizing wherein an example is disclosed as **[“shrinking partitions from 200 megabytes down to 127 megabytes by moving the right edge toward the left edge” (Column 16, lines 28-30)]** as disclosing measuring a partition in bytes/megabytes as well as cylinders. Lawrence further specifically discloses

Art Unit: 2185

measuring size in both; bytes and cylinders [**“the disk geometry specifies the sector size in bytes, number of sectors per track, number of heads (tracks per cylinder), and number of cylinders” (Column 12, lines 56-58)**]. Therefore, the partition has a size given in both; cylinder and bytes/megabytes. However, the combination of Ruff and Lawrence fail to disclose expressly “converting size measured in cylinders to megabytes and rounding the size to a minimum number of megabytes represented by said size measured in cylinders without changing the number of megabytes.”

Beardsley discloses “converting size measured in cylinders to megabytes” as using a converter so that by [**“knowing the cylinder, track, and record number of the desired data, the data is accessed and mapped into the respective 512-byte blocks” (Column 8, lines 36-39)**].

Stoddard further discloses “rounding the size to a minimum number of megabytes represented by said size measured in cylinders without changing the number of megabytes” as a method of manipulating and resizing disk partitions. Stoddard explains that [**“when resizing a segmented partition, the segments may be resized proportionally to achieve the desired partition size” and discloses one embodiment that involves “taking the desired partition size specified by the user and rounding it to a cylinder boundary” (Column 17, lines 3-9) and “adjusting the free space between the segments so it ends on a block boundary of the next volume being worked on” (Column 19, lines 27-31)**].

(US 6,173,360) by Beardsley et al., (US 6,453,383) by Stoddard et al., (US 6,088,778) by Ruff et al. and (US 6,253,300) by Lawrence et al. are analogous art because they are form the same field of endeavor of manipulating/modifying computer disk drive partitions.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system that permits manipulation of computer disk drive partitions taught by Ruff, provide the ability of sorting disk partitions from largest to smallest in order to allocate free space using this organization scheme supported by an allocation map, as disclosed by Lawrence further include the ability of converting a measure given in cylinders into byte/megabytes as described by Beardsley and further round this measure as taught by Stoddard.

The motivation for doing so would have been because Beardsley teaches that providing a converter to map cylinders to bytes/megabytes allows [**“a host system using a first interface to communicate with a storage system using a second interface” (Column 3, lines 52-54 and Column 8, lines 6-8) as “the converter 200 used to implement the mapping of the data and commands allows the VSS to appear to the open host system and work the same as any hard disk integral to the open host system” and explains that “the converter system 100 dynamically translates the 512-byte hard disk LBAs of the DASD 114 into cylinder, track, and record numbers” (Column 8, lines 36-39 and 19-23)]]. Another motivation for doing so is because Stoddard teaches that “taking the desired partition size specified by the user and rounding it to a**

Art Unit: 2185

cylinder boundary and adjusting the free space between the segments so it ends on a block boundary of the next volume being worked on” allows for **[“efficient, correct, and safe manipulation of volume segments and their accompanying volumes and partitions” (Column 28, lines 20-22) as all the free spaces between segments are “temporarily incorporated into the following segment as it is positioned in its new location and resized to its new size” (Column 17, lines 25-31) as this advantage allows for avoiding having free and unusable spaces between segments].**

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine (US 6,253,300) by Lawrence et al., (US 6,088,778) by Ruff et al., (US 6,173,360) by Beardsley et al. and (US 6,453,383) by Stoddard et al. for the benefit of creating a computer disk drive partition manipulation method to obtain the invention as specified in claims 3-4, 10-11 and 15-16.

26. **Claim 22** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruff et al. (US 6,088,778) in view of Beardsley et al. (US 6,173,360)

27. As per **claim 22** (Notice: claim 23 on Application has been renumbered to claim 22) Ruff discloses “the system as described in claim 20” **[See rejection to claim 20 above]** wherein Ruff teaches that disk drive cylinders contain sectors and that **[“a given sector on the disk 2 may be identified by specifying a head, a cylinder, and a sector within the cylinder” (Column 2, lines 15-17)].** Ruff also discloses that cylinders have a **[“starting address 42 and the ending address 44” (Column 4, lines 27-33)]** as specifying size boundaries for cylinders; explains that a **[“sector count 46 holds the total**

Art Unit: 2185

**number of disk sectors in the partition” (Column 3, lines 51-52)]** and further teaches a form of manipulating partitions that involves resizing wherein an example is disclosed as **[“shrinking partitions from 200 megabytes down to 127 megabytes by moving the right edge toward the left edge” (Column 16, lines 28-30)]** as disclosing measuring a partition in megabytes as well as cylinders. Therefore, the partition has a size given in both; cylinder and byte/megabytes. However, Ruff fails to disclose expressly that “a size of a partition is converted from cylinders to megabytes wherein a minimum number of megabytes represented by a number of cylinders.”

Beardsley discloses “converting size measured in cylinders to megabytes” as using a converter so that by **[“knowing the cylinder, track, and record number of the desired data, the data is accessed and mapped into the respective 512-byte blocks” (Column 8, lines 36-39)]**.

(US 6,173,360) by Beardsley et al. and (US 6,088,778) by Ruff et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating/modifying computer disk drive partitions.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system that permits manipulation of computer disk drive partitions taught by Ruff, provide the ability of converting a measure given in cylinders into byte or megabytes as described by Beardsley.

The motivation for doing so would have been because Beardsley teaches that providing a converter to map cylinders to bytes/megabytes allows **[“a host system using a first interface to communicate with a storage system using**

Art Unit: 2185

**a second interface” (Column 3, lines 52-54 and Column 8, lines 6-8) as “the converter 200 used to implement the mapping of the data and commands allows the VSS to appear to the open host system and work the same as any hard disk integral to the open host system” and explains that “the converter system 100 dynamically translates the 512-byte hard disk LBAs of the DASD 114 into cylinder, track, and record numbers” (Column 8, lines 36-39 and 19-23)].**

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine (US 6,088,778) by Ruff et al. and (US 6,173,360) by Beardsley et al. for the benefit of creating a computer disk drive partition manipulation method to obtain the invention as specified in claim 22.

## **VI. RELEVANT ART CITED BY THE EXAMINER**

28. The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is cited to establish the level of skill in the applicant’s art and those arts considered reasonably pertinent to applicant’s disclosure. See **MPEP 707.05(c)**.

29. The following references teach computer disk drive partition manipulation.

### **U.S. PATENT NUMBER**

US 5,675,769

US 5,435,004

US 6,108, 759

US 6,138,179

US 6,185,575

Art Unit: 2185

30. The following reference teaches manipulation of computer disk drive partitions by sorting.

**U.S. PATENT NUMBER**

US 6,366,911

31. The following reference teaches manipulation of computer disk drive partitions including converting measures/addresses given in cylinders to bytes/megabytes.

**U.S. PATENT NUMBER**

US 5,887,164

32. The following reference teaches manipulation of computer disk drive partitions in the Linux environment.

“Linux Partition How To,” by Tony Harris and Kristian Koehnopp, September 1, 2000

<http://cayanet.dnsalias.org/documentation/Linux/en/minihowtos/pdf/Partition.pdf>

**VII. CLOSING COMMENTS**

**Conclusion**

**a. STATUS OF CLAIMS IN THE APPLICATION**

33. The following is a summary of the treatment and status of all claims in the application as recommended by **M.P.E.P. 707.07(i)**:

**a(1) CLAIMS REJECTED IN THE APPLICATION**

34. Per the instant office action, claims 1-24 have received a first action on the merits and are subject of a first action non-final.



**b. DIRECTION OF FUTURE CORRESPONDENCES**

35. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yaima Campos whose telephone number is (571) 272-1232 and email address is [Yaima.Campos@uspto.gov](mailto:Yaima.Campos@uspto.gov). The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

**IMPORTANT NOTE**

36. If attempts to reach the above noted Examiner by telephone or email are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Mr. Donald Sparks, can be reached at the following telephone number: Area Code (571) 272-4201.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

December 5, 2005

  
DONALD SPARKS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Yaima Campos  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2185